views on the matter. I therefore earnestly request you to allow us to express our views so that you can give your considered opinion after hearing us.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Was he not one of the persons who participated yesterday ?

Sri K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO.—No, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am sorry I do not have a copy of the yesterday's proceedings in front of me.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Tomorrow, the Finance Minister is presenting the Budget and day after tomorrow, the general discussion on the Budget will take place. If you say that we can refer to it in the general discussion on the budget, then we lose our right to ask clarifications on the statement made by the Hon'ble Food Minister.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I did not say that I will not allow the Member to have clarifications to day. How it has come about the House is fully aware. If the Bill was over, today we would have been in a different position.

Sri S. SIVAPPA (Shravanabelagola).—Allowance of a clarification on the statement of the Food Minister has been conceded. This comes first. When you have agreed, we shall take it up. The question is whether the situation of food is more urgent and important or a Financial Bill like this raising the States revenue, is important ? These are two issues before us. Whether the drought conditions in the State are more important or a measure to impose tax on the people is more important is a matter for consideration. You have been very gracious and reasonable in saying that 'I am going to allow it and we shall take up tomorrow as the members are not ready.' You said yesterday like that. This should get priority as the scarcity conditions are prevailing in the State.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am thankful to the Leader of the Opposition for the very kind sentiments he mentioned by saying that I was gracious enough to say that it is to be taken up tomorrow. After all, I discharged the duties of the speaker. When this is to be taken up and whether this clarification should be taken up now is to be considered now. Sri Shivappa referred to a point of order. The point of order takes precedence. Point of order have been sufficiently discussed practically threadbare yesterday.

Sri G. V. GOWDA (Palya).—I was not allowed to support.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The members may kindly peruse Rule No. 311. It deals with the point of order.

Speaker's Ruling *re* : the Procedure for consideration of at Motion and the Amendment to elicit public opinion on Bills.

Mr. SPEAKER.—It is not as a matter of right I am trying to hear. Yesterday, Sri Annarao referred to sub-rule and explained how the

(MR. SPEAKER)

amendment should be considered and I said that so far as the discussion is concerned, it is open to the Chair and the discussion on the main motion and the amendments can be placed together.

Sri ANNARAO GANAMUKHI (Afazalpur).—You did not give any ruling on my point of order. I have a grouse that my point of order is not taken into consideration at all.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am sorry I do not know why he is entertaining a grouse. I do not know whether he has meant it. Why should he have a grouse against me ? On a Bill on prior occasion, we had decided what is to be done. This is what happened on 18th September 1963 in this House, when the Mysore Dramatic Performance Bill, 1963 was moved. There are identical points with regard to the moving or the other and that it should be circulated and taken up or that two could be taken up. It reads like this :

Sri R. M. PATIL (Minister for Municipal Administration).—I beg to move.

"That the Mysore Dramatic Performances Bill, 1963, be taken into consideration."

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಶಿವಪ್ಪ.—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭಾಪತಿಗಳೇ, ರಾಜ್ಯಾಂಗದತ್ತವಾಗಿ ಪ್ರಜೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಬಂದಿರತಕ್ಕ ಸ್ವಾತಂತ್ರ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ಅಡ್ಡಿ ತರತಕ್ಕ ಮನೂದೆಯನ್ನು ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಮಂಡಿನಲು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಪ್ರಯತ್ನಪಡುತ್ತಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರ ಈ ನೀತಿಯನ್ನು ಖಂಡಿನಲು ನಾವು ಸಭಾತ್ಯಾಗ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆ.

(The members of the Opposition staged a walk-out).

Mr. SPEAKER.—There were some amendments by three members demanding that this Bill be circulated for the purpose of eliciting public opinion. Amendments were moved by Sriyuts Sri Sivappa, Sri B. R. Sunthankar and Sri A. Krishna Shetty. It was said that unless the amendments were adopted, the Bill cannot be taken up.

Sri D. PARAMESHWARAPPA (Honnali).—Sir the Act of 1843 with regard to the dramatic performances is repealed. Let us find out the correct position.

Sri ANGADI CHANNABASAPPA (Hadagalli).—Sir, because the Acts have been repealed, they will not be available here in India.

Sri D. PARAMESHWARAPPA.—This is an important issue because it involves some constitutional bonds of legislation. Therefore, I request the Chair to give sufficient time. I suggest that an adjournment of the consideration of the Bill will be better also.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಶಿವಪ್ಪ.—ಕನ್ನಡ ಜನತೆಯ ಮೇಲೆ ವಿಶ್ವಾಸವಿಟ್ಟು ಕನ್ನಡ ಕಲೆಗೆ ಪ್ರೋತ್ಸಾಹ ಕೊಡತಕ್ಕ ಉದ್ದೇಶದಿಂದ ಈ ಮನೂದೆಯ ಚರ್ಚೆಯನ್ನು ಮುಂದಕ್ಕೆ ಹಾಕಬೇಕೆಂದು ನನ್ನ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಮಂಡಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Objection was raised saying that we have to speak on the amendments only and not on the merits of the Bill.

Sri S. M. KRISHNA —If the amendment is carried, then discussion on the Bill is postponed to a later date .. ..I request the Chair to take the amendment on its own merit and the Bill on its own.

Sri K. LAKKAPPA (Hebbur).—When such an amendment is tabled, the Chair should allow discussion on the amendment first and then the Bill may be considered.

Sri ANNARAO GANAMUKHI.—Sub-rule (2) says that the member in charge of the Bill may move that the Bill be taken into consideration and any member may move as an amendment that the Bill be circulated for the purpose of eliciting public opinion.

Mr. SPEAKER.—All thess discussions went on, covering pages. Ultimately, I said both of these will be open and the amendment will be put to the vote first and the Bill afterwards. This is more. I refer to page 277. I Passed on that book yesterday to Sri Krishna. This is what he says :

> "In the House of the People after a motion is moved, amendments to Motion are also permitted to be moved and both the Motion and the amendments are open for a single discussion."

That is what we have done and that is how we have decided on the last occasion. If there is anything in addition to that, the member may enlighten me.

Sri S. M. KRISHNA.—I am referring to more again on page 383 :

> "Motion for circulation : when such a motion as moved by a Member incharge or as an amendment, is being discussed, Members are not entitled to go into questions of principles of the Bill at all. The question before the House is a narrow question whether the Bill should be considered now or should be circulated and Members must confine their remarks to the narrow question. A similar situation arose in the Central Assembly in 1924."

Mr. SPEAKER.—That was according to the old Procedure.

Sri S. M. KRISHNA.—There, the President said :

> "I would remind the Hon'ble Member and the House that the question that is being debated at present is only the narrow question whether the Bill should be taken into consideration now or whether it should be circulated for opinion It is not open therefore to Members to go into the merits of the various points which they may wish to be further considered. They can merely indicate the points on which they think there should be further consideration by the country."

This also may be considered.

Sri K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO.—Sir, I wish to draw your attention to page 378 by S S. More on Practice and Procedure....

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble Member may kindly refer to references given in support of it. They are old. That is also the English procedure. I will examine the whole thing.

† Sri K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO.—When we discuss the question of amendment, we will not be discussing the principles of the Bill, Therefore, by passing of a resolution or an amendment for circulation. House is not committed to the principles of the Bill. Therefore, it is open to this House to speak on the merits of the Bill at a later stage and supposing we are asked to debate and consider the two together, we will be deprived of an opportunity of canvassing for circulation at the first instance and merits of the case at a later stage. Therefore, we are at a very preliminary stage for a limited purpose of considering whether this Bill should be circulated or should be considered by this House. Therefore, Sir, we will have to first decide whether we should discuss the principles or whether we discuss to take the public opinion, and then to come before this House, then consider the merits of the case in the light of the public opinion that we have collected. So, in that view of the matter, I believe even though the decision may be old, it is as good as gold. Therefore, I believe since this is a matter of principle, I wish whatever be the procedure that has been followed whatever might have been the rulings that the Hon'ble Speaker might have given in the past, I only wish that the Hon'ble Speaker devote a little more time and allow us to put our hands on some other rules of procedure and precedents in the House of Parliament and elsewhere and submit them. Therefore, this is a matter which cannot be lightly treated and discussed because it goes to the very fundamentals and principles. I wish the Hon'ble Speaker will bear this aspect of the matter while taking into consideration whether to allow discussion to go on with the limited scope of the amendment or we should go on with both.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble Member refers to page 378. I have glanced through some of them. I do not say my opinion is final. All those are under the old procedure where it was as a matter of rigid rule, that the amendment was always taken up first and decided upon, one after another. There was no question at any timce a series of amendments being put together. This is the procedure which has been evolved recently. If the Members go through the old decisions and old statements, normally the question is a proposition before the House; if any amendment is proposed, then that amendment is to be decided; if there are hundred amendments, those are to be taken up one after another and not collectively. Today, Members are not going to suggest that it is the procedure. Series of amendments are taken together. In fact there was no right for the Speaker to select amendments. Today, it is not like that. Even if notices on amendments are given, it is found to be dilatory, it is not liable to be admitted. In spite of that I am trying to find out whether there is anything in support of the point that what the House has decided upon, on the last occasion, should be revived again. I have got all those authorities in mind. I will pass on the book to Members

desiring to go through it. With regard to amendment, sanction of Government for circulation motion is necessary. It is on page 63 of the Book cited here. Giving his ruling on standing order 38, the President recalled the opinion of 20th September 1921. Our rules are not on this basis. So the ruling given on standing orders which were then in force should not be taken as governing today's situation. They are not the standing orders under which we are functioning.

The President recalled the Proceedings of 1921 in which he ruled that the Assembly was committed to the principles once it had passed any of the three motions mentioned in standing order 38. The standing order says that the House should not be considered to be committed to the Members of the Bill if it merely adopted a motion for its circulation. These are things which are cited from old standing orders which are different. Now the Members have to rely upon new rules. I request them to kindly interpret that and help me in interpreting it.

Members Representation.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Sir, under the rules of procedure, Members have got a privilege to come and sit in this House and deliberate. But the Speaker has got a place; the Deputy Speaker has got a place; the Legislature Secretariat officials have got a place; the V. I. P. and officials have got a place; the Press has got a place. I want to know whether plain clothed police officers can sit in the Press Gallery. A sub-Inspector of Police in plain clothes is sitting along with the Pressmen just behind the Marshall Is it at the instance of the Hon'ble Speaker or at whose instance the Sub-Inspector in Plain clothes is sitting there because we are under a sort of intimidation? It is a matter of privilege. I request the Hon'ble Chair to enlighten this House under whose permission he is sitting here.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I do not think any sub-Inspector has a right to sit in the Press Gallery.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—He has gone out.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Order, order. When a point is brought to my notice, I am trying to look into it. No Sub-Inspector in plain-clothes or otherwise has got a right to sit in the Press Gallery. If he is there, please see he is not there and ask him why he had come there, with whose permission and for what purpose.

Sri K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO.—On a previous occasion, the chair had mentioned that the Lounge is also included.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble Member may deal with the Point of Order. Otherwise, I will take that he has said all that he wanted to say. I have dealt with the point and if he still harps on it, how will we be able to transact our business?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ.—ಡಿ. ಪಿ. ಆರ್. ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಯಾರನ್ನಾದರೂ ಅರೆಸ್ಟ್ ಮಾಡುವು ದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವರು ವಾರಂಟ್ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಬಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆಯೇ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—Order, order. After I have dealt with the matter, what is this intrusion? Simply because the Hon'ble Member has an idea, does he think that he is entitled to interfere with the business of the House? I cannot really understand this.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—How can he be even in the Lounge. He has encroached upon the privilege of this House. He has to be dealt with seriously.

Mr. SPEAKER.—What applies to Sri Gopala Gowda, applies to Sri Sivappa also. I will call for a report.

(Sri Muckannappa stood) When I say I will call for a report, I really cannot understand why the same point is dealt with.

Speaker's Ruling re :—*Procedure for considerate motion and the amendment to elicit public opinion on Bills.*—(*Contd.*)

Sri K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO.—I quite concede that this is an old order under different set of circumstances. But, I for one would believe that the principles have remained the same. That is the reason why, though it was an old order, I quoted it. Even in our Rules of Procedure, Rule 73 says that one motion shall be moved and that there may not be two motions at the same time. It says: "the member in charge may make one of the following motions..." Therefore, any person can only make one motion and the House will have one motion before it for consideration.

Mr. SPEAKER.—According to this theory, I will not call upon any Member to move any amendment. The motion will be deliberated, voted upon and closed. There must be a reasonable limit to all these arguments.

Sri K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO.—The principle underlying is this: The Member in charge of the Bill can make a motion that it be taken into consideration or that it be circulated for eliciting public opinion. If he does not choose to move that it be circulated for public opinion, then it is open to any Member to do so. Supposing we consider the principles of the Bill and then send it out for circulation for the purpose of eliciting opinion thereon. It is just influencing public opinion. It looks as if we are giving our view in advance so that public opinion may be moulded in the light of our discussions. We circulate it for the public opinion so that the public may have an opportunity to express their opinion either in a legal manner or under any other manner or procedure they prefer. In that way, we will have an opportunity to have the benefit of the wisdom of public opinion; then we may consider the motion. It is in the light of that that the 1924 Ruling is given. Even though the circumstances have changed, I am of opinion that the amendment will have precedence over the principles of the Bill. There are two aspects. One aspect is, I may

or may not be opposed to the principles of the Bill. I may or may not be opposed to the circulation of this Bill for the consideration of the public. There are two independent principles. Before we consider and take any decision, these two things will have to be considered and the Members should be allowed to express themselves both on this as also on the principles. The 1924 ruling is not old; it is not outmoded or outdated. It is good even today.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—I would like to ask a simple question. Against which is this amendment directed ? Is it directed against the principles of the Bill ? If that is the case, it becomes an issue for special consideration. It is not against the consideration of the Bill the amendment is made. As Sri Suryanarayana Rao pointed out, this has got two aspects. One, to refer it to the consideration of the public opinion or not.

Sri K. H. RANGANATH (Mudigere S. C.).—I want to refer to sub-rule (3) of rule 73. A motion has been moved. Now an amendment has been moved. Sub-rule (3) of 73 gives an indication that the House should decide whether the House should consider the Bill at once or at a future date.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have to take the vote of this House. Otherwise, how else am I to decide ? I will take a vote. I have no objection. I will ask the House to decide. I put it to the House. Should I put it to vote ?

Sri ANNARAO GANAMUKHI (Afzalpur). Sir, reading clauses 73 and 74 together, I think we are driven to the conclusion that the two must be discussed separately. Now Sir, if you see clause 74 (3), I consider that the Bill may not be taken twice for consideration. The result of Circulation has been stated here :

> "(3) Where a motion that a Bill be circulated for the purpose of eliciting opinion thereon is passed, the Bill is circulated in accordance with that direction.....if he wishes to proceed with his Bill thereafter, shall move that the Bill be taken into consideration....."

Under clause 73 (3) there is motion for consideration. Again 74 (3) says, there must be a motion for consideration. Therefore the Bill cannot be taken into consideration twice. Only once it can be taken into consideration. It means that the motion for circulation must be discussed first and if it is rejected, and only then, the motion for consideration should be taken. That must be the procedure.

Mr. SPEAKER.—There is considerable confusion prevailing on this point. So far as the amendments are concerned, I will refer to our own rules—from rule 78 onwards. The old notion that the right of amendment or proposing an amendment is inherent and therefore every person who gives notice of an amendment is entitled to participate in the debate, move and get the support of others—all that was at a time

(MR. SPEAKER)

when amendments were not so many and the procedure was totally different. On account of various difficulties which were experienced in the past, the procedure has evovlved itself and one of the things that was done was to introduce what was known as 'closure' which was not there before. Because every Member was supposed to contribute all that he wanted—right, wrong or indifferent. When this right of closure was introduced, it is open to any Member to come forward and say that there has been sufficient debate, let it be put to vote.

If there is a series of amendment, then it is said—it is not that every amendment that can be discussed. The Speaker is given the discretion to choose the amendment. This is what is provided in the Rules. The Speaker has got the right to say how the debate should be regulated and that is exactly what has been done, not now, under this Bill, but in almost every Bill. Analogous is the procedure with regard to the cut-motions on Budget.

Now, what is it that has been said? Can I say that Members will speak on this motion for circulation referring only to circulation without referring to the principles or why it should be circulated? How can you do without referring to the principles, provisions, the far-reaching nature that is involved? Therefore, reference to the provisions is inevitable. It is for the reason that it has been said that certain matters can be discussed if it is going to be discussed twice. It wants that the person who is moving the amendment should be given the right to speak, put the amendment first and thereafter the main proposition. That is the procedure we have adopted, not today, but on all occasions. Now if Sri Ranganath suggests that the House has to decide, I do not think he is right. Though the right is vested in the Speaker, I am prepared to take the sense of the House. I am not here to participate in the debate. If the House is inclined to have it separately, I have no objection,—so that, the position is that, not that I have no right, but on the other hand, if the Members feel that the sense of the House should be taken, I am prepared to concede for this purpose. But I am not going to agree that the Speaker has no right. I am unable to accept that point.

SRI G. V. GOWDA.—Sir, 73(3) and 74(3) makes it absolutely clear, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER.—Yesterday, there was so much confusion and it was said that the Bill should not be introduced at all.

SRI G. V. GOWDA.—Sir, it says: that after the Minister moves that it may be taken into consideration, then any Member may move his amendment and the amendment may be that the consideration of the Bill be postponed till the opinion of the public is elicited. To that extent you have given a stay.

MR. SPEAKER.—I am unable to bring in any idea of stay at all.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—After it is brought again, the Minister has got to move for consideration. Consideration arises because it comes back after eliciting public opinion.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am prepared to spend a little time though I am not justified in spending the time of the House.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—Please read 73(2):

> "At this stage no amendments to the Bill may be moved, but if the member in-charge moves that his Bill be taken into consideration, any member may move as an amendment that the Bill be circulated for the purpose of eliciting opinion thereon by a date to be specified in the motion."

That means, if that amendment is accepted, it has got to be considered before the main motion, because there is no prohibition.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble Member has said it four times over. I said that I will put it to the vote of the House. If it is negatived, then it closes.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—Would not the discussion then become infructuous—any discussion on the merits of the Bill would become infructuous. It is an unnecessary waste of time.

2-00 P.M.

Sri V. S. PATIL (Belgaum-I).—Sir, My friend Sri Gowda has referred to sub-clause (3).....

Mr. SPEAKER.—Sri Patil propounds his own point, because he referred to sub-clause (2). What is the rule he is relying upon?

Sri V. S. PATIL.—Sub-rule (3) of 74.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The other Hon'ble Member said that he is not relying on that.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—Sub-rule (3) of 74 is:

> "Where a motion that a Bill be circulated for the purpose of eliciting opinion thereon is passed, and the Bill is circulated in accordance with that direction and opinions are received thereon, the member in charge, if he wishes to proceed with the Bill thereafter, shall move that the Bill be taken into consideration by the Assembly and if such a motion is carried, the member shall further move that the Bill be referred to a Joint or Select Committee unless the Speaker suspends the rule."

If the Bill is to be taken into consideration by the Assembly along with the motion for circulation, then this will be a second time, asking that the Bill be taken into consideration. That will be anamolous.

Mr. SPEAKER.—That is exactly why I said, if this amendment is passed, the other cannot be taken up. It will have to wait.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—That is why we cannot discuss the merits of the Bill this matter is disposed of.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—In sub-rule 2 of rule 73, it is very clearly stated "that the Bill be circulated for the purpose of eliciting opinion thereon by a date" that date has been specified in the motion. Then sub-rule 3 follows: "On the day on which any motion that the Bill be taken into consideration by the Assembly either at once or at some future day is moved"

i.e. after that mentioned in sub-rule (2) " the principle of the Bill and its general provisions may be discussed." It is clear.

Mr. SPEAKER.—It has been read by three members. The fourth reading is not improving in any way, whatsoever. Now the one thing that remains for me is to ascertain the sense of the House. Should I do it ? I can do it.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—There are certain things.....

Mr. SPEAKER.—Order, Order.

Sri P. VENKATAGIRIYAPPA (Kolar).—Sir.....

Mr. SPEAKER.—Order, Order. I am not going to put it to the vote of the House. Now, Sri R. S. Hegde may continue.....

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Sir, I was called upon and I have never even begun. I will speak. Is there no ruling Sir ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—Upon what ?

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—About this.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have said that this is perfectly correct. The procedure that is followed is correct as we made on the Dramatic Performance Bill in 1963. The Member will continue.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—The Member wants to know whether he can speak on the amendment or the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I suppose, Sri Muckannappa is intelligent and vocal enough.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ನಾನು ಮೊಟ್ಟಮೊದಲನೆಯದಾಗಿ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಎಸ್. ಎಂ. ಕೃಷ್ಣ ಅವರು ತಂದಿರತಕ್ಕ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯ ಮೇಲೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ನಿನ್ನೆ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಕೃಷ್ಣ ಅವರು ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಾ ಭೂಕಂದಾಯದ ಮೇಲೆ ಈ ಸರ್ಚಾರ್ಜು ಹಾಕುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ, ಇದನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಬಹಳ.....

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—Sir, a clear indication has not been given whether the Hon'ble Member is to speak first only on the amendment, *i.e.*, the amendment referring the Bill back to elicit public opinion and then that that Bill be brought back to this House after eliciting public opinion and on that day when the Bill comes back after eliciting public opinion, the general principles and merits of the Bill be discussed. That is in

sub-rule (3). That is the provision—I am very much interested—that must be decided.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I said both are before the House. Members are within their rights to speak on both. If they do not want to speak on both, they may speak on one, or if they so choose, they may not speak on both.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—Suppo e we decide that this Bill be referred back to elicit public opinion...

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am going to rule on hypothetical opinion.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—I suppose, Sir, I have made my position very clear.....

Mr. SPEAKER.—Sri Sivappa may or you may not agree with me. He may have confidence in me or he may not have confidence in me.

Sri K. LAKKAPPA.—I rise to a point of order. It is this. The Hon'ble Speaker has ordered to debate on two motions. There are two motions.....

Mr. SPEAKER.—Which rule has the member in mind which is being violated ?

Sri K. LAKKAPPA.—Regarding rule 73, 74.....

Mr. SPEAKER.—Is Sri K. Lakkappa questioning my ruling ?

Sri K. LAKKAPPA.—No Sir. I have no right to question your ruling.

Mr. SPEAKER.—But if he refers to the same sections ?

Sri K. LAKKAPPA.—Sir, there are two motions before us, according to you. Can we have a discussion clubbing these two motions, together whether this House has a right to discuss two motions, which are quite opposite to each other. Therefore, I have got a doubt in my mind.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I cannot give rulings on doubts.

I am getting certain slips from Members that they wish to participate. would like to make the position clear. We have exceeded the time that has been allotted to this. Yestsrday I was given to understand. I felt, that the Bill would be passed today. If Members wish to speak, they must co-ordinate among themselves. Otherwise, I will have to apply the guillotine. Members may please not take it as a threat. Let them not make it possible for me to apply the guillotine. I appeal to the Members to help me. Instead of sending me slips, let the whips agree among themselves as to how the time should be utilised and then let them tell me. If they do not, I will take proper action. Now, Sri Muckannappa may continue.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—Sir, the chair was pleased to state that after the point of order is disposed of...

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have called upon Sri Muckannappa.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—With regard to the statement made by the Food Minister.....

Mr. SPEAKER.—Sri Sivappa may please note that after I am able to finish the Bill, I will devote the rest of the time for that. I said, I will consider. Should I say that I wont Consider.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—I am not saying anything fresh, Sir...

Mr. SPEAKER.—Order. Order.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—We may have no leisure at all. I must be clear about that. Should I not, Sir?.....

Mr. SPEAKER.—Order. Order.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—am I not.....

Mr. SPEAKER.—Order. Order.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—Sir.....

Mr. SPEAKER.—Order. Order. The Speaker has to be on his legs, I suppose, when he is unable to control the member sitting.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—You said that you are going to intimate the Members.....

Mr. SPEAKER.—Order. Order.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—I really do not understand. ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು ಕೋಪ ಮಾಡಿ ಕೊಂಡರೆ ನಾವು ಇನ್ನು ಯಾರಿಗೆ ಹೇಳಬೇಕು.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am trying to understand things. I called upon the Member and he has begun. If he yields, I have no objection. It does not matter to me in the least. But, if the Member is not yielding, and when I called Order, Order, and Members desist, then it becomes exceedingly difficult. If anybody knows that the business should be...

(Interruption of Sri S. Gopala Gowda)

I call Sri Gopala Gowda to Order, Order.

He knows that when I am on my legs, not only he should not stand but he should not commit the double mistake of talking while sitting.

Now, I was putting it to the House, I said that I would consider. In fact I have been anxious that there should be clarification so far as the statement is concerned. But the members will not give me co-operation and if on the other hand they say I must do as individual members say, I am unable to do it.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—According to Chair's own statement.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am prepared to be guided by the House but not by any single member.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—It is not a question of being guided by what a single member says. I speak on behalf of a party. I request you...

Mr. SPEAKER.—Order, order.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—I request to let this House know..

Mr. SPEAKER.—Order, order.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—Should not the House know? I request the Hon'ble Speaker to let us know when we can elicit information on the statement made by the Hon'ble Food Minister. Please indicate the time so that I may be prepared to be present in the House. I am entitled to know that and it is the privilege of the House to know it. The Hon'ble Speaker has made clear that he will give time for that.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The hon'ble member is defeating the very object for which he is speaking. If he wants clarification, then by trying to deal with the matter like this, it is not at all helped. The hon'ble member says that he wants to know when it is going to be taken up so that he may arrange other work or whatever it is and be present here. I expect all members to be present at all times. Such of the members who have other work during the period when the House is in session, they do so at their own convenience. My idea is to give time for clarification soon after the Bill is over. I have made that clear. Now Sri C. J. Mukkannappa will speak on the Bill.

MYSORE LAND REVENUE (TEMPORARY SURCHARGE) BILL, 1966.

Motion to Consider (Contd.)

†ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ನಿನ್ನೆಯಿಂದ ಪ್ರಾರಂಭವಾದಂತಹ ಭೂಕಂದಾಯದ ಮೇಲೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ತೆರಿಗೆಯನ್ನು ಹಾಕತಕ್ಕಂಥ ವಿಧೇಯಕ ಏನಿದೆ ಇದು ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಅಪ್ಯಾಯಮಾನವಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದು ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಆಡಳಿತವನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವ ಪಕ್ಷಕ್ಕೆ ಅಪ್ಯಾಯಮಾನವಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದನ್ನು ಜನಾಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಕಳುಹಿಸಬೇಕು. ಇದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಜನಾಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡ ಮೇಲೆ ಎಷ್ಟರಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಜನತೆಯ ಮೇಲೆ ಈ ತೆರಿಗೆಯನ್ನು ಕಾರ್ಭಾರವನ್ನು ಹೊರಿಸಬೇಕು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ತಯಾರು ಇಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದಾದರೆ ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಾವು ಏನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂಬುದು ತಿಳಿಯುದೇ ಹೋಗಿದೆ. ನೆನ್ನೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಹಣಕಾಸಿನ ಸಚಿವರು ಇದು ಚರಿತ್ರೆಯಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ಮೊದಲನೇ ಬಾರಿಗೆ ಇಂಥಾ ವಿಷಯದ ಮೇಲೆ ಜನಾಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ಶೇಖರಣೆಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೊರಟಂತಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಹಣಕಾಸಿನ ಸಚಿವರು ಇನ್ನೂ ಯುವಕರು, ಮತ್ತು ಪ್ರೋಗ್ರೆಸೀವ್ ಆಗಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇಂಥಾ ವಿಷಯದ ಮೇಲೆ ಜನಾಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೂ ಇವರಿಗೆ ಏನು ತೊಂದರೆ. ಇದೆ? ಯಾವ ರೂರ್ಸ್ ಪ್ರೋಸೀಜರ್ ಅಡ್ಡ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ? ಇದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಜನಾಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿಕೊಡಿ. ಇವೊತ್ತಿನ ದಿವಸ ಆಡಳಿತಪಕ್ಷದಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ ಅನೇಕ ಜನ ನನ್ನ ಸ್ನೇಹಿತರು ಇದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಜನಾಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಸ್ಥಿತಿಗತಿಗಳು ಏನಾಗುತ್ತವೆಯೋ ಎಂದು ಚಾಮುಮುಚ್ಚಿಕೊಂಡು ನುಮ್ಮನೆ ಕುಳಿತುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದರಿಂದ ಜನತೆಯ ಮನಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಏನು ಪರಿಣಾಮವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಆಡಳಿತವನ್ನು ವಹಿಸತಕ್ಕ ಪಕ್ಷದವರು ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಿಲ್ಲ. ತಮ್ಮ ಒಂದು ಪ್ರತಿಷ್ಠೆಗೋಸ್ಕರ ಜನತೆಯಮೇಲೆ ಭೂಕಂದಾಯದ ಮೂಲಕ ಸರ್‌ಚಾರ್ಜ್‌ನ್ನು ಹಾಕುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ವಿಧೇಯಕದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಡಕವಾಗಿರತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಏನು ಎನ್ನುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಜನಾಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡು ಇದನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಆಡಳಿತಪಕ್ಷದವರಿಗೆ ಧೈರ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ. ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ನಿಜಲಿಂಗಪ್ಪನವರು ಪ್ಲಾನಿಂಗ್ ಕಮಿಷನ್ನಿನವರ ಹತ್ತಿರ ಹೋಗಿ ಲ್ಯಾಂಡ್ ರೆವಿನ್ಯೂ ಸರ್‌ಚಾರ್ಜ್ ಹಾಕಿ ನಾಲ್ಕನೇ ಪಂಚವಾರ್ಷಿಕ ಯೋಜನೆಗೆ ಅಗತ್ಯವಾದ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಶೇಖರಣೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆ ಎಂದು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಮಾತುಕೊಟ್ಟು ಬಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ರೀತಿ ಅವರು ಪ್ಲಾನಿಂಗ್ ಕಮಿಷನ್ನಿನವರಿಗೆ ಮಾತು ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಬಂದಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಇವೊತ್ತಿನ ದಿವಸ ನಿರ